



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,091	12/21/2001	Holly Hogrefe	25436/2152	1719

27495 7590 11/01/2005

PALMER & DODGE, LLP  
KATHLEEN M. WILLIAMS / STR  
111 HUNTINGTON AVENUE  
BOSTON, MA 02199

EXAMINER

HUTSON, RICHARD G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1652

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/035,091

Applicant(s)

HOGREFE ET AL.

Examiner

Richard G. Hutson

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 10-14, 20, 22-26 and 30-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-26 and 30-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 10-12, 14, 20, 22 and 36-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/2005.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 10/17/2005.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/1/2004 has been entered.

Applicants amendment of claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 14, 20, 22, 36, 37, 44, 48 and 50 and cancellation of claims 6, 9, 18 and 21, in the paper of 7/26/2005, is acknowledged. Claims 1-3, 10-14, 20, 22-26, and 30-51 are still at issue and are present for examination

Claims 23-26 and 30-35 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 2 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 2 and 13 are dependent on rejected claims 1 and 12, respectively.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 10-12, 14, 20, 22, 44 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3, 14, 44 and 50 are indefinite in the insertion of "(SEQ ID NO: 10)" into these newly amended claims. The relationship of "SEQ ID NO: 10" to JDF-3 DNA Polymerase in the claim is unclear. It is thus unclear how "SEQ ID NO: 10" is used in these claims as discussed above.

Claims 1, 10-12, 20, 22 are indefinite in that they are drawn to a mixture comprising a first enzyme that comprises DNA polymerization activity. Since claims 2 and 13 depend from claims 1 and 12, respectively, and require that the first enzyme is a DNA polymerase or reverse transcriptase. This brings into question what enzymes have DNA polymerization activity that are not also DNA polymerases or reverse transcriptases. Thus the claims are indefinite or claims 2 and 13 are duplicative of claims 1 and 12.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 10-12, 20, 22, 36-39, 40-43, 44-47 and 48-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in

Art Unit: 1652

such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 10-12, 20, 22 are directed to all possible enzyme mixtures comprising a first enzyme and a second enzyme wherein said first enzyme is any enzyme which comprises any DNA polymerization activity. The specification, however, only provides a those representative species in which the first enzyme is a DNA polymerase or a reverse transcriptase, encompassed by these claims. There is no disclosure of any enzymes beyond DNA polymerases and reverse transcriptases, that have DNA polymerization activity and applicants have not described a particular structure to function/activity relationship in the disclosed species (See also 112 second paragraph rejection). Given this lack of additional representative species of those enzymes beyond DNA polymerases and reverse transcriptases that have DNA polymerization activity, as encompassed by the claims, Applicants have failed to sufficiently describe the claimed invention, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms that a skilled artisan would recognize Applicants were in possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 36-39, 40-43, 44-47, 48-51 are further rejected under this statute because each of these claims recite that the first enzyme is "a Taq DNA polymerase" (claims 36-39 and 48-51), "a KOD DNA polymerase" (claims 40-43) "a JDF-3 DNA polymerase" (claims 44-47) when applicants have only described those Taq, KOD and JDF-3 DNA polymerases described on page eleven of applicants specification. As an organism

Art Unit: 1652

contains more than one type of DNA polymerase, applicants have not described those DNA polymerases in addition to the single species listed on page eleven.

Applicant is referred to the revised guidelines concerning compliance with the written description requirement of U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, published in the Official Gazette and also available at [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The rejection of claims 1-3, 10-14, 20, 22, 36, 37, 48 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,436,149) and Komori et al. (Protein Engineering, Vol 13. No. 1, pages 41-47, 2000) is hereby withdrawn based on applicants amendment and accompanying argument.

### ***Double Patenting***

Applicants comments in response to the previous statutory type double patenting rejection regarding the canceling of the subject matter of claims 1-3, 6, 9-11, 13-15, 19 and 21-23 of copending application 10/079,241 are acknowledged, however it is further acknowledged that applicants along with the cancellation of claims 1-3, 6, 9-11, 13-15, 19 and 21-23 of copending application 10/079,241, added new claims 64-87 drawn to overlapping subject matter, thus necessitating a provisional nonstatutory double patenting rejection.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the

Art Unit: 1652

unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 10-14, 20, 22 and 36-51 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 64-70, 75-87 of copending Application No. 10/079,241. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed enzyme mixtures of the instant application, comprising a first enzyme and a second enzyme wherein said first enzyme comprises a DNA polymerization activity and said second enzyme is a mutant Pfu DNA polymerase having a mutation at an amino acid position selected from the group consisting of D405, Y410, T542, K593, Y595, Y385, Y387, and G388 and those further limited claims dependent thereon are anticipated by and thus obvious over the corresponding claims of copending Application No. 10/079,241, drawn to a enzyme mixture comprising a first enzyme and a second enzyme wherein said first enzyme is an Archaeal DNA polymerase and said second enzyme is a mutant Archaeal DNA polymerase having a mutation at an amino acid position selected from the group consisting of D405, Y410,

Art Unit: 1652

T542, K593, Y595, Y385, Y387, and G388 and those further limited claims dependent thereon.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant acknowledgment of this provisional rejection is acknowledged, as well as applicants statement of their intent of filing a terminal disclaimer as a means of overcoming the rejection at the time at which the claims are found otherwise allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard G. Hutson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0930. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am to 4:00 pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on (571) 272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Application/Control Number: 10/035,091  
Art Unit: 1652

Page 8

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard G. Hutson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Richard G Hutson, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1652

rg  
10/12/2005